

**REMARKS**

Claims 8-34 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 31-34 are added, claims 1-7 are cancelled, and claims 8, 9, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27 and 28 are amended. Independent claims 8, 13, 20 and 27 are amended to even more clearly distinguish over the applied references by reciting that the selected images that are reduced and displayed are displayed on a screen arranged in a display order based on selection information, without taking into account an order in which the images are stored in memory, in response to a display command. These features are supported by the original specification at, for example, Figs. 10, 12 and 14 and page 19, line 28 - page 22, line 2. The dependent claims have been amended to improve their grammar and, with respect to claim 9, as requested by the Examiner in the Office Action. Thus, no new matter is added by the above amendments.

The Office Action objected to the title. Applicants submit that the amended title overcomes the objection.

Claim 9 was objected to by the Examiner. As noted above, claim 9 has been amended as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,635,984 to Lee. This rejection is moot with respect to cancelled claims 1, 2 and 6, and is respectfully traversed with respect to the remaining claims.

Lee does not disclose or suggest displaying, in response to a display command, selected images arranged in a display order based on selection information, without taking into account an order in which the images are stored in a memory, as recited in each of the independent claims of this application. While Lee teaches displaying only selected images out of a plurality of images stored in memory, Lee does not disclose or suggest arranging the selected images based on stored selection information, and without taking into account an order in which the images are stored in memory. Rather, as shown in all of the examples

illustrated in Figs. 11B-11F of Lee, the selected images are displayed in the order corresponding to the order in which the images are stored in memory (as shown in Fig. 2).

Thus, Lee does not disclose or suggest the combinations of features recited in the independent claims of this application. Withdrawal of the rejection based upon Lee is requested.

Claims 3, 15 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of Re 33,316 to Katsuta et al. This rejection is moot with respect to cancelled claim 3, and is respectfully traversed with respect to claims 15 and 22. Katsuta et al. does not overcome the deficiencies in Lee noted above. Accordingly, claims 15 and 22 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to their corresponding independent claims.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 16, 17, 19 and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,187,776 to Yanker and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,037,939 to Kashiwagi et al. This rejection is moot with respect to cancelled claims 4, 5 and 7, and is respectfully traversed with respect to the remaining claims. Neither Yanker nor Kashiwagi et al. provides the deficiencies noted above with respect to Lee. Accordingly, claims 16, 17, 19 and 23-25 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to their corresponding independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of Yanker. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 30 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 27. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.


Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,309 to Anderson. Anderson does not provide the deficiencies noted above with respect to Lee. Accordingly, independent claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-10 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the other independent claims of this application. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of Anderson, and further in view of Yanker. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 11 and 12 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 8. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

MAC/ccs

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: March 7, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------